ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED A.D. 1720.

FOR SEA, FIRE, LIFE AND ANNUITIES.

CHIEF OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON.

FUNDS, £4,000,000. CLAIMS PAID, £28,000,000.

FIRE.

INSURANCES ARE GRANTED AGAINST LOSS OR DAMAGE BY FIRE on PROPERTY of almost every description, at Moderate Rates.

LIFE.

DEATH DUTY POLICIES—Payment Direct to Revenue Authorities before grant of Probate.

Apply for Full Prospectus to

E. R. HANDCOCK, Secretary.

MIDLAND RAILWAY HOTELS.

LONDON - MIDLAND GRAND - St. Pancras Station, N.W.
(*Within Shilling cab fare of Gray's-inn, Inns of Court, Temple Bar, and Law Courts, &c. 'Buses to all parts every minute. Close to King's Cross Metropolitan Railway Station. The Venetian Rooms are available for Public and Private Dinners, Arbitration Meetings, &c. New Parisian Restaurant for French Cooking and fine Wines.*)

LIVERPOOL - ADELPHI - Close to Central (Midland) Station.
BRADFORD - MIDLAND - Excellent Restaurant.
LEEDS - QUEEN'S - In Centre of Town.
DERBY - MIDLAND - For Peak of Derbyshire.
MORECAMBE - MIDLAND - Tennis Lawn to Seashore. Golf.
Residential Hotel—HEYSHAM TOWER, nr MORECAMBE. Lovely Country. Golf.
Tariffs on Application. *Telegraphic Address "Midotel."*

WILLIAM TOWLE, Manager Midland Railway Hotels.

X *IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS* X

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of

LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without special valuation and at low rates.

ALLIANCE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1824. Capital, £5,000,000 Sterling.

HEAD OFFICE: BARTHOLOMEW LANE, LONDON.

Chairman: RIGHT HON. LORD ROTHSCHILD.

LONDON BRANCHES: 1, ST. JAMES'S ST., S.W.; 60, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.; NORFOLK STREET, STRAND; 3, MINCING LANE, E.C.

LIFE AND FIRE INSURANCES AT MODERATE RATES.

Life Policies free from Restrictions, with Perfect Security and Liberal Bonuses.

Special forms of Policies have been prepared to provide for payment of ESTATE DUTIES.

LEASEHOLD AND SINKING FUND POLICIES.

Full Prospectuses on application. ROBERT LEWIS, Chief Secretary.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS - - - - - -	£3,000,000
INCOME - - - - - -	£373,000
YEARLY BUSINESS - - -	£1,000,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE - -	£11,000,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c.:—Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Next Bonus as at 31st December, 1901.

OFFICES: 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

VOL. XLI., No. 48.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 25, 1897.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS 773
THE RELIEF OF UNDERLESSEES AGAINST FORFEITURE 775
THE EARLY RECORDS OF THE LAW SOCIETY 776
REVIEWS 777
CORRESPONDENCE 777
LAW SOCIETIES 779
NEW ORDERS, &c. 779
LEGAL NEWS 780
WINDING UP NOTICES 780
CREDITORS' NOTICES 780
BANKRUPTCY NOTICES 781
PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.

Cases Reported this Week.

(BEFORE THE VACATION JUDGE.)

Companies Act, 1867, Re, and Re the Companies Act, 1877, and Re Dan Rylands (Lim. and Reduced) 778
Daimler Motor Co. (Lim.) v. Bowen 778
Willett v. Taverner 778

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. JUSTICE RIDLEY took over the Vacation Sittings on Wednesday. He intimated that the court will not sit on Wednesday, the 6th of October, but that there will be a sitting on Friday, the 8th of October. With that exception the court will sit upon Wednesday in each week.

WE OBSERVE with pleasure that the Court of Common Council have at last taken in hand the question of the covenant, hitherto contained in leases granted by the Corporation of the City of London, that all assignments should be prepared by the Comptroller. As most of our readers are aware, the practical effect of this provision is that the assignee's solicitor prepares the assignment in the usual way and submits it to the Comptroller, who graciously approves it and pockets the fee for its preparation; the assignee having thus to pay double fees for such preparation. It is stated that the court resolved that for the future assignments of leases (we presume all leases, although the report speaks of "building leases") need not be prepared by the Comptroller, but that all assignments should be registered by him on payment of a small fee. The covenant not to assign without licence is still to be retained, but the usual proviso is to be added that the licence shall not be unreasonably or vexatiously withheld. The effect of this sensible resolution will be, not only to save the pockets of assignees of corporation leases, but also, we hope, to shorten assignments by rendering it unnecessary to recite or mention the grant of the licence to assign. There seems to be no reason why the licence should not be given by a separate document, the fact of its having been given being stated in the memorandum of registration indorsed on the assignment.

A RATHER curious point arises under the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Acts, 1888 and 1891. The former Act (section 10) defines "assurance" as including "will," and provides that every assurance of land to or for the benefit of any charitable uses shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the Act, and unless so made shall be void. One of these requirements, as everyone knows, is that the assurance must, within six months after the execution thereof, be enrolled in the Central Office. The Act of 1891 (section 5) enacts that "land may be assured by will to or for the benefit of any charitable use," but does not say that it may be so assured free from the requirements of the Act of 1888. This, however, must apparently be the meaning as regards enrolment, since it cannot have been intended that a will, which has no effect during the lifetime of a testator, should be enrolled within six months "after the execution thereof," although the testator may be still living. However this may be, we understand that the Master of the Rolls in 1893 expressed an opinion in writing that a will operating, under section 5 of the Act of 1891, to assure land to a

charity does not require enrolment and ought not to be enrolled under the Act of 1888; and we are informed that enrolment of such wills is refused at the Enrolment Office.

We hear that great difficulty is being experienced at licensing sessions in some parts of the country owing to the fact of magistrates holding shares in brewery or other companies owning public-houses or hotels in the same district or in an adjoining district. The neighbourhood has to be scoured to find a member of the bench who in these days has not invested in such shares. Section 60 of the Licensing Act, 1872, is explicit in disqualifying any justice who "holds any share in any company which is a common brewer, distiller, maker of malt for sale, or retailer of malt or of any intoxicating liquor in the licensing district, or in the district or districts adjoining to that in which such justice usually acts"; and in *Attorney-General* v. *Willett* (60 J. P. 643) Lord Russell decided that a justice disqualified under section 60 from acting on a licensing committee is also disqualified from voting in the election of such committee. It is stated that the Home Secretary has intimated an opinion, in reply to a case stated by the magistrates' clerk at Leicester, that justices who hold shares in a company which owns public-houses for the purpose only of leasing them to other persons are not disqualified from acting at licensing sessions. We presume, however, that such a justice would be disqualified from acting in respect of the premises owned by the company in which he is interested, under the words of the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 60.

The latest proposal for the relief of the High Court is embodied in a recent letter to the *Times* under the signature of "Lex," but it may be doubted whether it will be received with general approval. The writer complains of the delay which has taken place in extending the jurisdiction of the county courts and reforming their practice. The only manner in which the Legislature notices them is by imposing upon them fresh and novel duties which there is no other tribunal at hand ready to take up. The latest instance of this is the transformation of county court judges into arbitrators for the purpose of settling any questions which may be brought before them under the Workmen's Compensation Act; but, as the writer of the letter points out, "no idea is entertained or hint given of any equivalent in remuneration or consideration for this 'added part of the duties of the county court,' but the court is looked upon—as it has been for so long—as a useful odd-hand, upon whom can properly be thrust all odd jobs of this kind, and not as one of the regular retinue of the servants of the law." It remains to be seen how this particular addition to the duties of the county court judges will work in practice. Meanwhile it is suggested that the true solution for the difficulties of the High Court in keeping abreast of its work is to confine the judges of the High Court to London, and to leave all the business in the provinces for the county courts. "Why not," says "Lex," "leave all the High Court judges in London to provide for London, and leave the provinces to county courts with the necessary jurisdiction? and does not that seem the simple and obvious solution of the dilemma?" A proposition so bold does not, perhaps, call for any immediate reply. The abolition of all assizes, civil and criminal—for the suggestion seems to go as far as this—is a measure calculated to give pause to the most ardent reformer. Perhaps we are taking the letter too literally in assuming that judges, who are already liable to have to decide cases in common law, equity, bankruptcy, and admiralty, are also to take up the criminal work of the country and try persons accused on a capital charge. But even if the county courts were to monopolize only the civil business, the proposal seems to go pretty far. That the county courts have yet attained to the limit of their usefulness no one would maintain. Possibly a reconstruction of the system might at once raise the position of the county court judges and afford relief to the High Court. But the provinces are not prepared to dispense altogether with the judges of that court.

The finding of a coroner's jury seems to be in law equivalent to the finding of a grand jury, and an inquisition of murder or manslaughter amounts to an indictment for such crime. It is, however, nowadays invariably the custom, when a person is found guilty of one of these grave offences at an inquest, to charge him nevertheless before a magistrate, and if he is committed for trial, to present an indictment against him. Hence, when the accused comes to trial he has to meet both an inquisition and an indictment. The futility of this double procedure was clearly shewn in the case of *Reg.* v. *Lewinsky*, tried at the Old Bailey last week. The prisoner was indicted for murder by stabbing the deceased with a knife. In the course of the proceedings the prosecution abandoned the graver charge and asked the jury to convict of manslaughter. The jury, however, found a verdict of *not guilty*. Whereupon counsel for the Crown, with the approval of the judge, demanded that the prisoner should be tried again next day upon the inquisition. He was accordingly put on his trial next day for the second time; but by that time both judge and counsel had discovered, what is undoubtedly the law, that the prisoner was entitled to plead *autrefois acquit*, and that no second trial could take place. What, then, is the use of the double procedure? It seems clear that a prisoner may be tried at the same time both on the indictment and on the inquisition, but there can be no possible advantage in this. Neither can there be any advantage in his being put on his trial first on the one and then on the other, for whether the verdict on the first trial be "guilty" or "not guilty" *autrefois convict* or *autrefois acquit* may be pleaded in bar to the second charge. The double procedure therefore seems to serve no good purpose whatever, while, on the other hand, it must in some cases add greatly to the costs. It is also very puzzling to an ignorant prisoner to be called upon to plead, first to the indictment, and then to the inquisition. Any one who has been often present at murder trials must have noticed the bewildered look on the face of a prisoner, who, having just pleaded "not guilty" to the indictment, is immediately asked to plead to the inquisition, as if he might possibly be guilty on the one charge and not on the other. It is submitted that the law on this subject should be simplified, and that when a coroner's jury finds a verdict of murder or manslaughter against any person, the verdict should be considered merely as a direction to charge such person with the offence before a magistrate. He should then be tried only upon indictment for the offence for which he is committed for trial by the magistrate.

The recent decision of the Court of Appeal in *Universo Insurance Co. of Milan* v. *Merchants' Marine Insurance Co.* (45 W. R. 625) affirms with regard to marine insurance policies generally the custom with respect to the liability for premiums which has long been judicially recognized with respect to Lloyd's policies. In the matter of premiums the insurance broker is not merely an agent to receive the premiums from the assured and pay them to the underwriter. He is himself a principal and recovers the premiums from the assured, while he is liable to an action for them at the suit of the underwriter. Between the underwriter and the assured there is in this respect no privity, though the underwriter is directly liable to the assured for losses. "The general rule of law is, that the broker is the debtor of the underwriter for premiums, and the underwriter the debtor of the assured for losses" (Arnould on Marine Insurance, 6th ed., p. 194). But a Lloyd's policy has the peculiarity that it confesses the receipt of the premium by the underwriter, and this, taken with the custom under which the underwriter gives the broker credit for the premium, is considered to be equivalent to an actual payment by the broker and an advance of the money again to him by the underwriter. "By the course of dealing," said Parke, J., in *Power* v. *Butcher* (10 B. & C. p. 347), "the broker has an account with the underwriter; in that account the broker gives the underwriter credit for the premium when the policy is effected, and he, as the agent both of the assured and the underwriter, is considered as having paid the premium to the underwriter, and the latter as having lent it to the broker again, and so becoming his creditor. The broker is then considered as having paid the premium for the assured." All this, so far as a Lloyd's policy is concerned, is well settled, but in the "company's policy" which came in question in the recent case there was no admission of payment of the premium to the underwriter, while the policy contained

an express undertaking on the part of the assured that they would pay the premium. Hence it was contended that the custom under which the underwriter looks only to the broker for payment of the premium was in contradiction with the terms of the policy, and so was excluded. The Court of Appeal held, however, that the custom prevailed, notwithstanding the apparent contradiction, and that the underwriters, who were unable to recover the premiums from the brokers because of their insolvency, were not entitled to recover from the assured. The mode of dealing in accordance with the custom, said Lord ESHER, M.R., was not a contradiction of the policy, but was a mode of carrying out the contract embodied in the policy. It may be said, therefore, that the custom prevails universally, notwithstanding the form of the particular policy, unless, indeed, the policy should be so framed as obviously to exclude the custom.

THERE IS an amusing simplicity in the arrangement for the performance of sanitary work which appears to find favour with the judge of the City of London Court. According to the published report of a case recently heard there, a builder had been employed by the owner of a house to do certain repairs upon the incoming of a new tenant. The repairs were estimated to cost £85, and they were duly executed and the £85 paid by the landlord. But in the course of the work the sanitary inspector of the local authority came along, and thinking certain other work to be necessary, he ordered the builder to do it. Under these circumstances it might be supposed that the sanitary inspector, or his principals, the local authority, would be liable to the builder for the £10 which was the cost of the extra work, and that, if the order had been properly given, that amount would be recoverable by the local authority from the landlord, though whether an order involving the landlord in liability could in any case be given in this casual manner is, to say the least of it, very doubtful. But the builder, instead of adopting this course, sued the landlord for the £10, and Mr. Commissioner KERR has allowed his claim. It may be that the work was necessary and that it was work for which under the Public Health Acts the landlord could have been made to pay. But for the inspector to give the order to the builder, and for the court, without more, to fasten the bill on the landlord, seems just a little to anticipate the landlord's liability.

THE RELIEF OF UNDERLESSEES AGAINST FORFEITURE.

THE effect of section 14 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, was to give to lessees a claim to relief against forfeiture which was denied to underlessees. The Conveyancing Act, 1892, by section 4, remedied this defect, and at the same time carried the underlessee's claim to relief beyond that of the original lessee. But though in *Imray* v. *Oakshette* (45 W. R. 681) the Court of Appeal have affirmed in theory this advantage in favour of the underlessee, their decision in that case seems to go far to rob the advantage of any practical importance.

Previously to 1881 there was power either in equity or by statute to grant relief against forfeiture for non-payment of rent and in certain other cases, but the power was made more extensive by the Conveyancing Act. Sub-section (2) of section 14 is couched in general terms, and enables relief to be given in all cases where a lessor is proceeding, by action or otherwise, to enforce a right of re-entry or forfeiture, and the only exceptions engrafted on this general rule are those contained in sub-section (6). The section does not extend to a covenant or condition against the assigning, under-letting, parting with the possession, or disposing of the land leased; or to a condition for forfeiture on the bankruptcy of the lessee, or on the taking in execution of the lessee's interest; or to certain covenants in a mining lease. In the excepted cases the court has no discretion, and the lessor is entitled, if he so chooses, to take advantage of the forfeiture. The case of forfeiture for non-payment of rent is also excluded from section 14, and is left to be governed by the previously existing law.

It was probably not foreseen at the passing of the Act of 1881 that an underlessee would not be able to obtain the benefit of section 14, although the hardship of enforcing a forfeiture against him may be much more severe than in the case of the original lessee. The forfeiture may have been incurred through no fault of his own, and where he holds only a part of the demised property, the act or omission complained of may not touch his premises. But it was decided that such was the effect of the Act of 1881 (*Burt* v. *Gray*, 39 W. R. 429; 1891, 2 Q. B. 98), and the defect was remedied by section 4 of the Act of 1892. This provides that where a lessor is proceeding, by action or otherwise, to enforce a right of re-entry or forfeiture under any covenant, proviso, or stipulation in a lease, the court may, on the application of an underlessee, make an order vesting the whole term in him upon such conditions as to payment of expenses or damages or otherwise as the court thinks fit. This enables the lessor to get rid of the original lessee, and the underlessee steps into his place. But in making this addition to the provision of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, the Legislature omitted the exceptions which were incorporated in section 14, and hence in the case of an underlessee the court is empowered to grant relief, whatever be the cause of forfeiture, even though it is an assignment without licence or the bankruptcy of the original lessee.

That this is the effect of the Act of 1892 was decided by CHARLES, J., in *Cholmeley School* v. *Sewell* (1894, 2 Q. B. 906). There the lessor sought to enforce against underlessees a forfeiture incurred by reason of the bankruptcy of the original lessee, and for which, consequently, such lessee could not have obtained relief. It is to be noticed that the primary object of section 4 was to amend the defect in the Act of 1881 revealed by *Burt* v. *Gray* (*supra*), and since it is provided that the Acts of 1881 and 1892 are to be read together, it was possible to argue that section 4 of the latter Act was subject to the exceptions introduced in section 14 of the Act of 1881; in other words, that the relief granted to the underlessee was to be commensurate with the relief granted to the original lessee. "No doubt," said CHARLES, J., "there is considerable difficulty in the matter, for if the construction contended for by the defendants be the correct one, the Legislature has now said that the underlessee is to have in one sense a better right than the lessee himself, for it has used language which, upon that interpretation of it, is capable of including the case of an underlessee in a set of circumstances in which the lessee himself would be unable to apply for relief." There is, however, as the learned judge proceeded to point out, no reason for refusing to the underlessee this wider relief. It may well be, indeed, that the underlessee has a better claim to relief than the lessee would have. "I can imagine," he said, "many cases in which it would be inequitable to allow a head lessee to apply for relief, but where it would be right to allow a sub-lessee to apply, and I think this case is one of them. It would not be right to allow a lessee who had managed his affairs so badly as to become a bankrupt to apply for relief under any conditions whatever, and it seems perfectly consistent that he should be excluded while the Legislature allows the underlessee to apply for and obtain relief if he is a fit person to have it." Accordingly CHARLES, J., held that there was under the Act of 1892 jurisdiction to grant relief to an underlessee against a forfeiture incurred by reason of the bankruptcy of the original lessee.

In *Imray* v. *Oakshette* (*supra*) the forfeiture, of which the lessor was seeking to take advantage, had been incurred by reason of a breach of a covenant in the lease against assigning or sub-letting the premises without the consent in writing of the lessors. Exactly, therefore, as in *Cholmeley School* v. *Sewell* (*supra*) there could be no relief granted if the Act of 1892 was to be read subject to the limitations of the Act of 1881, though it would be different if full effect was given to the language of the former Act. But upon this point the Court of Appeal (LOPES and RIGBY, L.JJ.) adopted the judgment of CHARLES, J. Section 4 of the Act of 1892 is not to be read into section 14 of the Act of 1881 so as to be subject to the same exceptions as the latter section. "I come to the conclusion," said RIGBY, L.J., "that section 4 was deliberately intended to be a parallel section, and that the discretion given to the court does involve a power (in very exceptional cases, I agree) to give relief to an underlessee, even though it might be a case of a breach of a covenant not to assign."

It is settled, therefore, that under the Act of 1892, relief can be given to an underlessee in cases of forfeiture incurred by reason of the bankruptcy of the lessee or by reason of a breach of a covenant against assignment, but there does not seem to be any adequate justification for the parenthesis in the above quotation from the judgment of RIGBY, L.J., restricting the relief to very exceptional cases. By the sections under consideration the Legislature has adopted and extended the policy of interfering in the contractual relation of landlord and tenant, and the apparent intention of the statutes is to prevent forfeiture altogether, provided that the position of the lessor is not substantially prejudiced. In the case of original lessees an exception is made where the forfeiture is incurred through bankruptcy or through breach of a covenant against assignment. The reason of the exception is not perhaps obvious, as in either case the court might be trusted to see that no damage was done to the lessor, and in the case of bankruptcy the forfeiture may inflict serious hardship on the creditors of the lessee. However, under the Act of 1881 these cases are removed from the discretion of the court, and no question upon them can arise. But when once it has been decided that the exceptions do not apply in the case of underlessees, it seems to follow that underlessees are entitled to the full benefit of the relief accorded to them without any reference to the limitations in section 14. In the case of forfeiture for bankruptcy it may be inferred from *Cholmeley School* v. *Sewell* (*supra*) that proper effect will be given to section 4 of the Act of 1892; but, according to the present decision of the Court of Appeal, it will hardly be possible to give relief in any case of forfeiture incurred by reason of a breach of a covenant against assignment. Whether or not the holder of the underlease has in fact knowledge of the covenant against assignment, it is his duty to call for the lease, and hence he has constructive notice; and the rule is the same even though he is by statute precluded from taking this course. The statutory prohibitions of the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, and the Conveyancing Act, 1881, can be varied by express contract, and they do not, therefore, interfere with the doctrine of constructive notice (*Patman* v. *Harland*, 29 W. R. 707, 17 Ch. D. 353). RIGBY, L.J., suggested the possible case of the covenant against assignment being taken by a separate instrument not referred to in the original lease. Under such circumstances the underlessee might well take without notice, either actual or constructive, of the covenant, and he would be entitled to relief against forfeiture. But the case was admitted by his lordship to be not very probable, and by itself it does not seem to give scope for the effect which it is settled section 4 of the Act of 1892 ought to have. According to the Court of Appeal, constructive notice of the covenant is sufficient to debar the underlessee from the right to relief; and in *Imray* v. *Oakshette* relief was refused on this ground, notwithstanding that the underlessee had spent a large sum of money on the premises. The result is, that by section 4 the Legislature have conferred upon the underlessee the right of relief in all cases, including forfeiture for breach of a covenant against assignment, while by the decision of the Court of Appeal the relief is to be refused under the only circumstances which are ever likely to occur. Practically, therefore, underlessees will still have to treat the covenant against assignment as one a breach of which will involve the forfeiture of the demised premises.

The *American Law Review* says that some of the judges of the State courts in St. Louis have the unfortunate practice, common in police courts and better suited to that atmosphere, of holding private conferences with counsel in their chambers outside the regular sessions of the court, touching matters which ought to be heard only in open court, where there is an opportunity for the opposing counsel to listen, and where there is that publicity which it is the aim of the constitution to secure. The practice of some of the country judges is even worse. They not only hold private back-door conferences with lawyers, but when they get the case under advisement they consult with the whole county as to the best way to determine it. The judges of the St. Louis Circuit Court have another practice which is regrettable. It is that, when they pass upon the requests for instructions in a jury trial, they call the counsel up to the judicial seat and examine the instructions with them, and hold whispered conferences with them. In other jurisdictions, where judicial procedure is better conducted, counsel argue their requests for instructions to the court, and where the judge is in doubt he hears opposing argument. This clears up many questions and prevents the multiplication of new trials.

THE EARLY RECORDS OF THE LAW SOCIETY.*

THE records which have been published by the Incorporated Law Society, with an introduction by Dr. EDWIN FRESHFIELD, give an interesting proof of the corporate vitality of attorneys and solicitors in the course of the last century. Apparently, the Association of Gentlemen Practisers arose out of the friendly and convivial meetings of the members at a period antecedent to the commencement of these records, but in the words of Dr. FRESHFIELD: "Without losing its quality of conviviality, the association gradually added to it the objects of mutual improvement, self-government, and protection, until the society became that which it is now—the most powerful of the London guilds." The records commence in the year 1739 and go on till 1810, when there is a gap till 1825. But there seems no reason to doubt that the society was being actively carried on in this interval, and the missing documents may yet be discovered. Quite recently a pamphlet, printed in an appendix at p. ci., has been found which refers to the action taken by the society in 1822 with respect to the inconvenience caused by Chancery King's Counsel practising in the courts of the Lord Chancellor and of the Vice-Chancellor.

The earliest minute is dated the 13th of February, 1739, and enunciates the object for which the society was to be carried on. "At a meeting of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity, held on the 13th of February, 1739, the meeting unanimously declared its utmost abhorrence of all male and unfair practice"—that is, of malpractice—"and that it would do its utmost to detect and discountenance the same." To this end a general meeting was to be held twice a year—namely, on the next day after Hilary and Trinity term, and a committee of twenty-one members was to meet every month, with five as a quorum, "to consider of such methods as might best answer the purposes aforesaid, who were to report the same and their opinion thereon at the next general meeting." Subsequent records do not preserve the objects of the society on quite so high a level. Self-protection becomes a prominent feature, and the art of dining is frequently exemplified. At first the dinners were held at a tavern, afterwards at Clifford's-inn Hall, and at length, in 1806, "the consideration of a proper house for the society to meet in for the future was held, and the committee being of opinion that the society will be well accommodated at the Freemasons' Tavern, they gave directions for the next dinner at that place." The proper observance of this function is kept up to the last, and the minutes end with the ordering of a dinner for 120 gentlemen at 7s. 6d. a head each, exclusive of 2s. a head for dessert. It seems that every member was expected to take a ticket for the dinner, whether he attended or not, and the penalty for not doing so was expulsion. The style of menu which obtained a century and a-half ago may be seen in the bill of fare which the Scriveners' Company found time to draft at one of their meetings after dealing with the more serious matter of their struggle with the Law Society. Here it is:

Five dishes of fish, consisting of salmon and trout, "soals," &c.,
Three dishes of lobster and shrimp sauce,
Three hams,
Four dishes of chicken, three in a dish,
Two venison pasties,
Four dishes of colleyflowers, cabbages, carrots, &c.

For the second course:

Four haunches of venison,
Four dishes of French beans,
Four ducks in two dishes,
Two currant tarts,
Two raspberry and currant tarts,
Five stands of fruit.

After this feast the scriveners were probably disposed to abate for a time something of their hostility to their rivals.

In 1745 the Law Society took seriously in hand the question of unworthy members of the profession, and several instances occur in which attorneys and solicitors were, on the motion of the society, struck off the rolls. In one case counsel was instructed to inform the court that the society would at all times be ready, at their own expense, to prosecute attorneys for any unfair practices, and to use their utmost endeavours to detect all illegal practices and to prosecute attorneys and solicitors who should be surreptitiously admitted. But the great feature in the records is the litigation between the Law Society and the Scriveners' Company over the right to do conveyancing within the City of London. Of this litigation a full and most interesting account is given by Dr. FRESHFIELD in the introduction. The Scriveners' Company was incorporated by royal charter in the reign of James I., but for centuries before that time it had existed as a guild. Among

* The Records of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the Courts of Law and Equity called the Law Society. Compiled from manuscripts in the Possession of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom. Published by the Incorporated Law Society.

the duties of scriveners was the preparation of deeds and wills, and if the document was of an important nature the scrivener was advised by counsel. At the same time conveyancing had, by the middle of the last century, come to be done by attorneys and solicitors, and the scriveners in the City of London being much exercised by this, endeavoured to induce the Court of Common Council to pass an Act compelling all persons doing the same business as themselves to take up their freedom in the Scriveners' Company. But this the Common Council declined to do until the scriveners had established at law their right to the exclusive practise of their craft, and in particular their right to enforce against attorneys and solicitors a bye-law of the City passed in 1712, which imposed penalties on any person, not being free of the City, who should "directly or indirectly use, exercise, or occupy any art, trade, mistery, manual occupation, or handicraft" within the City. The penalties were to be recovered by suit in the name of the chamberlain in any court of record within the City.

Accordingly, in 1749 the Scriveners' Company caused an action to be commenced in the Mayor's Court in the name of Sir JOHN BOSWORTH, the chamberlain of the City of London, against an attorney of the name of ALEXANDER, and the committee of the Law Society promptly made arrangements to assist ALEXANDER in his defence and to defray his expenses. The first step taken by him was to question the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court to entertain an action against an attorney of the superior courts, and this he did by writ of privilege. The scriveners took proceedings to quash the writ, and the matter was argued in November, 1750. No judgment was given, but the Court of King's Bench declared their opinion to be in favour of the plaintiff, and LEE, C.J., recommended ALEXANDER to submit and to qualify himself by taking up his freedom in the City. The scriveners regarded this as a victory, and they now prevailed upon the Common Council to pass the desired Act for compelling all persons who used or exercised the occupation of scriveners within the City of London to become freemen of the Scriveners' Company. In May, 1752, the Law Society passed a resolution denying the validity of the Act, and undertaking to defend at the expense of the society any proceedings which should be taken upon it. Later in the same year the action against ALEXANDER abated by reason of the death of Sir JOHN BOSWORTH, and a fresh action was commenced in the name of THOMAS HARRISON, the new chamberlain. This, like the previous one, was on the bye-law of 1712, not upon the recent Act of Common Council, and the same proceedings were taken by writ of privilege to question the competency of the Mayor's Court. The arguments on the writ were postponed from time to time till 1754, when judgment was given remitting the matter to the Mayor's Court, but without prejudice to the right of the defendant to plead his privilege there. The outcome was that ALEXANDER pleaded his privilege by way of demurrer when the action came on to be heard before the recorder, and the recorder decided against the plea. Then there was an appeal to a court of error, and the proceedings on this preliminary matter were protracted till 1758, when judgment was given upholding the decision of the recorder. ALEXANDER was declared to be "noways entitled to privilege as an attorney of the Court of King's Bench, as the action against him was a customary action founded upon the bye-law of the City of London, and the City courts had in such cases an exclusive jurisdiction."

After all these years of skirmishing the parties prepared for the trial of the question at issue between them on its merits, and this took place before the Recorder in December, 1760. From the result it seems that the attorneys need not have been so anxious to escape the jurisdiction of the City court. At their instance the Recorder directed that the cause should be tried by a jury of foreigners—that is, of persons who were not free of the City—and the jury being of opinion that the drawing of deeds was the proper business of an attorney, gave a verdict for the attorneys. The Scriveners' Company not unnaturally objected to the form in which the question had been left to the jury, the real point being, not whether the drawing of deeds was the proper business of attorneys, but whether, under the bye-law, they were entitled to exercise this business within the City without being free thereof. But no further proceedings were taken, and the position of the attorneys and solicitors was secured. A full report of the trial, taken from the shorthand writer's notes, is given in the present volume.

A dispute of a different nature arose in 1766 between the Law Society and Mr. Serjeant DAVY in consequence of the latter having stated in the course of a trial that nineteen cases out of every twenty were lost by the ignorance or negligence of the attorneys. Upon remonstrance the incautious serjeant made a suitable apology, as well he might, and subsequently he is found giving his services to the society gratuitously in proceedings for striking an attorney off the rolls. Other instances occur in which the society found themselves compelled to criticize the conduct of counsel, and notably in the matter already referred to, of attendance in the Chancery courts. But the details of this controversy we must leave for the reader's own perusal. Altogether the volume, which is very handsomely printed, will be found full of interest.

REVIEWS.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Precedents of Leases, with Practical Notes. By JOHN ANDREWS, M.A. (Oxon.), Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Estates Bursar, Wadham College. Third Edition. By C. DE COURCY HAMILTON, B.A., LL.B., Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature. Reeves & Turner.

The Law of District and Parish Councils: being the Local Government Act, 1894, and the amending Acts; also the Agricultural Gangs Act, 1867; the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883; the Allotments Acts, 1887 and 1896; the Baths and Washhouses Acts, 1846 to 1896; the Burial Acts, 1852 to 1885; the Fairs Acts, 1871 and 1873; the Infant Life Protection Act, 1872; the Knackers Acts; the Lighting and Watching Act, 1833; the Petroleum Acts; the Public Improvements Act, 1866; the Public Libraries Acts, 1892 and 1893; and numerous Extracts from other Statutes; together with Selections from the Orders, Circulars, and Memoranda of the Home Office, Local Government Board, Education Department, and Charity Commissioners, an Explanatory Introduction, numerous Notes, and a full Index. By JOHN LITHIBY, LL.B. (Lond.), Barrister-at-Law. Effingham Wilson; Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

CORRESPONDENCE.

COUNTY COURTS.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Practitioners and litigants have for a considerable period been pressing for a complete revision of the present county court system, and with no result, and why? The reason is not far to seek. There has been no combination.

The Incorporated Law Society, which is supposed to directly represent solicitors, and, through them, the country generally, and which should always be in the first rank in the advance of law reform, is very apathetic on the subject of county courts, because, forsooth, the gentlemen who constitute its council do not practise in these courts, and therefore consider the matter unworthy of much notice.

The agitation in opposition to the recently annulled county court rules has shewn that the profession requires just a little stimulus before it will act, but that when once aroused it is not easily pacified.

I submit therefore with confidence that a County Court Reform Association will supply a much-needed want, and I shall be glad to see expressed in succeeding issues the views of other county court practitioners on the matter. PHILIP COHEN.

7, Waterloo-street, Birmingham, Sept. 20th.

"VOSSIONER."

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—With reference to the query in your issue of the 18th inst. as to the meaning of the phrase "parsson and pattron and vossioner of the church and parish," I may state, on the authority of *Notes and Queries* (1st series, p. 224), that the expression is a corruption of "voseignor," an Italian word signifying "your lord" or lord—*i.e.*, proprietor or owner. Many similar words were introduced by the Italian ecclesiastics inducted into Church livings during the 16th century. J. H. JACKSON.

19, Old-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C., Sept. 20th.

[We are indebted to the courteous sub-librarian of Lincoln's-inn for the information that in the same volume of *Notes and Queries* (ix., 1854), at p. 334, two correspondents suggest that the word "Vossioner" is a corruption of "vowsoner"—*i.e.*, the owner of the "vowson"—an old form of "advowson."—ED. *S. J.*]

A Heywood correspondent informs the *Times* that the licensing magistrates of that town decided on Wednesday to grant a wine licence to a local beerseller for £100. A month ago, at the annual licensing meeting, several applications for new licences were made, and Dr. Torrop, one of the licensing magistrates, then asked what the applicants were prepared to pay as a *quid pro quo* for the licences asked for. Nothing was promised, and all the applications were refused. Since then one of the unsuccessful applicants has thought the matter over, with the result that yesterday he offered £50 or £100 for a wine licence. The magistrates granted the application and accepted £100. At the first licensing meeting they were informed by counsel that they had no power to receive money in this matter, but Dr. Torrop replied that the law did not matter, and that if the magistrates got any money they would apply it to a fund for the extinction of licences not required by the public.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Before the Vacation Judge.

THE DAIMLER MOTOR CO. (LIM.) *v.* BOWEN. 17th Sept.

MORTGAGE—TRADE MACHINERY—MORTGAGE OF LAND NOT MENTIONING FIXTURES—TITLE TO FIXTURES OF PERSON CLAIMING UNDER MORTGAGOR.

This was a motion on behalf of the plaintiffs, the Daimler Motor Co. (Limited), Andrew Pears, and Marian Pearson Pears, wife of the said Andrew Pears, for an order that the defendants, Kerbey, Bowen, and James Amos, and each of them, their respective servants and agents, be restrained until the trial of the action or further order from parting or otherwise dealing with such part of the fixed plant, machinery, and effects now or late at the Launch Works, Eel Pie Island, Twickenham, as are included in an indenture of mortgage dated the 18th of August, 1896, and made between the plaintiffs, the Daimler Motor Co. (Limited), of the one part and the plaintiffs Andrew Pears and Marian Pears of the other part. In support of the motion it was said that the defendant Bowen had already given a satisfactory undertaking until the trial, and the present motion, therefore, only affected the defendant Amos. The facts were as follows: On the 18th of August, 1896, the plaintiffs, the Daimler Motor Co., being entitled to the freehold of certain launch works situate in Eel Pie Island, Twickenham, and to the fixed plant, machinery, and effects thereon, mortgaged the same to Andrew Pears and Marian Pearson Pears. The plant, fixed machinery, and effects upon the premises were not expressly mentioned in the mortgage On the 8th of July, 1897, the plaintiffs, the Daimler Motor Co., sold and assigned the property and works to the defendant Bowen subject to the mortgage, and at the time of the sale Bowen delivered to them a signed inventory of the plant, fixed machinery, and effects then existing on the premises. The bulk of the plant, machinery, and effects comprised in the inventory were at the date thereof, and up to a few days since, fixed to the freehold, and formed part of the security given by the mortgage. On or about the 25th of August last the secretary to the plaintiff company was informed by the solicitor to the mortgagees, Mr. and Mrs. Pears, that he had ascertained that some of the machinery of the works had been taken and prepared for removal, and as such machinery was included in the mortgage, he insisted upon its return, otherwise proceedings would be instituted for the preservation of the security, and the secretary thereupon wrote to the defendant Bowen to that effect, asking him at once to replace any machinery that he might have removed and notify him immediately that he had done so. No reply was received to this letter. In consequence of a further communication from the solicitor to Mr. and Mrs. Pears, the secretary of the plaintiff company telegraphed to the defendant Bowen informing him that on no account must the machinery be removed, and at the same time he instructed Mr. Ashfield, one of the plaintiff company's employés, to proceed to the works and ascertain what had been done. Mr. Ashfield ascertained that the whole of the fixed machinery had been removed from the works and placed on a barge which was lying off the island, and that a son of the defendant Amos was in charge of the barge, who stated that his father had bought the machinery from the defendant Bowen. Mr. Ashfield thereupon informed Amos, jun., that the defendant Bowen had no right to sell the machinery, but he replied that he intended to remove it by 3 o'clock that afternoon (the 27th of August). Mr. Ashfield also saw the defendant Bowen's employé, who was in charge of the works, and remonstrated with him with regard to the removal of the said machinery, but the employé remarked that he had no power at all over the machinery, and declined to take any orders from him, whereupon Mr. Ashfield telegraphed to the defendant Bowen, saying, "Stop removal of machinery; solicitors threaten to take proceedings." Unless restrained by the court the defendants would continue the removal of the machinery and the security under the mortgage would thereby be irretrievably depreciated. The articles sold to the defendant Amos were fixed or fastened to the floors of the premises in the manner following: Six small lathes and two drilling machines were fastened or fixed to wood of the first floor of the premises by means of coach screws, and an 8in. lathe, one shaper, one drilling machine, and one planing machine were all resting on the ground floor, and were steadied by being fastened to wooden blocks let into holes in the ground. The machines were screwed on to the blocks by means of coach screws. The defendant Amos removed nearly all the fixtures. Under these circumstances it was submitted that the mortgage from the Daimler Co., though silent as to fixtures, passed them by operation of law: *Re Yates* (36 W. R. 563, 38 Ch. D. 112), *Hobson* v. *Gorringe* (45 W. R. 356; 1897, 1 Ch. 182). Fixtures so passing included all things permanently or quasi-permanently attached to the freehold: *Longbottom* v. *Berry* (L. R. 5 Q. B. 123). It therefore followed that the things sold by Bowen to the defendant Amos were subject to the mortgage. The defendant Amos was not a *bonâ fide* purchaser for a value without notice, for, as Bowen was not the owner, the defendant Amos only took such title as Bowen had, and, therefore, could not legally secure the fixtures as against a mortgagee out of possession: *Huddersfield Banking Co.* v. *Lister* (43 W. R. 567; 1895, 2 Ch. 273); Sale of Goods Act, 1893, s. 21. Further, at the time the defendant Amos purchased them the fixtures were part of the freehold, and he therefore had constructive notice of any defects in the title of Bowen: *Patman* v. *Harland* (17 Ch. D. 353). For the defendant Amos it was said that the mere fact that bolts and screws had been taken out of the things was not sufficient to constitute notice to him. The plaintiffs must shew that the defendant Amos had notice of the mortgage, but he had a right to assume that Bowen, whom he found in possession, was entitled to detach and sell the fixtures.

BYRNE, J., made the following order by consent: Without prejudice to any question, and the plaintiffs undertaking as to damages, the defendant Amos undertakes to give, free of expense, and the plaintiffs to accept within one week delivery of the articles hereinafter mentioned. The plaintiffs undertake to warehouse the articles delivered till judgment, and to pay the expenses of warehousing in the first instance, such expenses to be borne as the judge directs at the trial. The articles to be delivered to be such of those in the barge as the plaintiffs select. Pleadings to be delivered notwithstanding the vacation. The action to be set down for trial at once. No other order except that costs be costs in the action.—COUNSEL, *E. A. Nepean; Alexander*, Q.C., and *Spence; Newton Crane*. SOLICITORS, *Michael Abrahams, Sons, & Co.; Campion & Simmons; Buchanan & Hurd*.

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

WILLETT *v.* TAVERNER. 17th Sept.

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION—NO WRITTEN CONSTITUTION—RECEIPT OF FUNDS BY OFFICER—APPLICATION OF FUNDS FOR WORK OF INSTITUTION—INJUNCTION.

This was a motion upon behalf of the plaintiffs, William Willett and William Finnigan, suing on behalf of themselves and all other the members of council of the Spurgeon Memorial Sermon Society, for an order restraining the defendant, his agents, bankers, and servants from dealing with (otherwise than by payment into court) the sum of £93 or any other sum now standing to the credit of an account kept in the name of the defendant at the Hove-Brighton Branch of the Capital and Counties Bank (Limited), until the trial of the action or further order, or alternatively for an order directing the defendant, his agents, bankers, and servants to pay the said sum of £93 or the amount now standing at the credit of the account into court to abide the order of the court. The plaintiff Mr. William Willett is a member of the council of the society and Mr. Finnigan is honorary secretary.

BYRNE, J., in giving judgment, said that the case was a most unfortunate one. The Spurgeon Memorial Sermon Society was brought into existence with a good intention. It was founded by Mr. William Taverner, the defendant, and carried on by him for a certain time under his sole control. After some years certain persons were appointed members of the council. The society had no written constitution. As to the duties of the council there was no information before the court beyond a statement that they were appointed as an advisory council and that the defendant continued, as he had done, to collect and dispose of the funds of the society. On the 22nd of February, 1897, the defendant entered into an agreement signed by Mr. William Willett, as president of the council, and Mr. William Finnigan, as treasurer, on behalf of the council under which the council agreed to engage the defendant as secretary to the society at a salary of £100 per annum, payable monthly, the engagement to be determinable by six months' notice in writing or by six months' salary in lieu of notice given by the council to the defendant, or by six months' written notice given by the defendant to the council, or by any shorter notice on which the council and the defendant might mutually agree. After his appointment under that agreement the defendant continued to act as he had previously in reference to the society. The contract entered into by the defendant was a contract of service with a power of dismissal by the council. Upon behalf of the plaintiffs it was said that the defendant had been properly dismissed by the council, but that question could not be determined at present. *Primâ facie* the dismissal appeared to have been the action of the council, but it appeared to have taken place at a meeting of which many of the council did not receive notice. No point had been made that the defendant intended to apply any funds subscribed to the society for any purpose other than to carry out the work of the society. The defendant declined to give an undertaking that he would not deduct his monthly salary. Assuming that he had been properly dismissed, he was merely carrying out what he had previously done. Ought an injunction to be granted in face of the fact that it was sworn that a considerable number of the council were not present at the meeting at which the resolution to dismiss the defendant was passed? A regularly-constituted meeting of the council might be called at which the wishes of the council could be regularly ascertained. It was stated by the defendant that he did not intend to apply the funds of the society otherwise than he had hitherto done and for the work of the society. Under these circumstances there would be no injunction, and the costs would be reserved until the trial.—COUNSEL, *Alexander*, Q.C., and *H. J. H. Mackay; E. Fletcher; F. Dodd*. SOLICITORS, *Willett & Sandford; R. A. Harding; Cameron & Kemm*.

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

***Re* THE COMPANIES ACT, 1867, AND *Re* THE COMPANIES ACT, 1877, AND *Re* DAN RYLANDS (LIM. AND REDUCED).** 22nd Sept.

COMPANY—REDUCTION OF CAPITAL—CONFIRMATION BY COURT—DISPENSATION WITH USE OF ADDITION TO TITLE OF WORDS "AND REDUCED"—SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES—COMPANIES ACT, 1877 (40 & 41 VICT. c. 26), s. 4.

This was a petition by Dan Rylands (Limited and Reduced) praying for the confirmation by the court of a special resolution passed by the company for reduction of its capital, and that the minute hereinafter set out might be approved by the court, and further, that the addition of the words "and reduced" to the company's name might be dispensed with altogether. In support of the petition it was said that the company was incorporated in the year 1888 under the Companies Acts, 1862 and 1886, as a company limited by shares. The registered office was situate at the Hope Glass Works, Stairfoot, near Barnsley, in the county of York. The objects for which the company was established were the carrying on of

the business of bottle, box, wire-twisting, and mineral water machinery manufacturers and other objects set forth in the memorandum of association thereof. The original capital of the company was £130,000, divided into 14,000 7 per cent. cumulative preference shares of £5 each, and 12,000 ordinary shares of £5 each. The capital had since the incorporation of the company been increased, and the present capital of the company was £270,000, divided into 35,000 cumulative preference shares of £5 each, and 19,000 ordinary shares of £5 each. Shortly after the incorporation of the company it commenced and had since carried on business. The company had issued 25,965 of its preference shares and 16,617 of its ordinary shares, and the sum of £5 per share had been paid up thereon. By clause 1 of the articles of association of the company it was provided that the company might from time to time reduce its capital. By a special resolution of the company, duly passed and confirmed in accordance with section 51 of the Companies Act, 1862, at extraordinary general meetings of the company held respectively on the 27th of July, 1897, and the 11th of August, 1897, it was resolved as follows:—"That the two agreements dated the 10th day of July, 1897, and made between . . . George Hebert Peake, on behalf of all the holders of preference shares in the company, of the one part, and the company of the other part, and the other made between . . . William Thomas Howroyd, on behalf of all the holders of ordinary shares in the company, of the one part, and the company of the other part, be and the same are hereby sanctioned and approved, and that, such agreements having become binding by virtue of clause 40 of the articles of association, the directors do carry into effect the scheme thereby adopted—that is to say, the outstanding debentures of the company to be paid for or satisfied by issuing 4½ per cent. debentures of the company secured as a first charge on the undertaking of the company; the preference shareholders to abandon and release all right to dividend on the preference shares held by them respectively up to the 30th day of September, 1897, except such dividend (if any) as the directors may declare thereon for the year ending the 30th of September, 1897; as from the 30th of September, 1897, the dividend on the preference shares to be reduced from 7 per cent. per annum to 5 per cent. per annum; the capital of the company to be reduced by cancelling two-thirds of the outstanding ordinary shares and the capital represented by the same." The capital represented by the ordinary shares which had been issued by the company was £83,085. Previously to the passing of such special resolution paid-up capital of the company to the extent of £55,400 and upwards had been lost. The losses had chiefly occurred through the manufacture of glass and carbonic acid gas. The reduction of the capital did not involve either the diminution of any liability in respect of unpaid capital or the payment to any shareholder of any paid-up capital. The form of minute proposed to be registered was as follows:—"The capital of Dan Ryland's (Limited) henceforth is £214,610, divided into 35,000 preference shares of £5 each, 2,383 ordinary shares of £5 each, and 16,617 ordinary shares of £1 13s. 4d. each, instead of the former capital of £370,000, divided into 35,000 preference shares of £5 each, and 19,000 ordinary shares of £5 each. At the time of the registration of this minute 25,965 of the said preference shares and all of the said 16,617 ordinary shares of £1 13s. 4d. have been issued and have been and are to be deemed fully paid up—that is to say, the sum of £5 has been and is to be deemed to be paid up on each of the said 16,617 ordinary shares." None of the said 2,383 ordinary shares of £5 each had yet been issued. It was true that the usual practice was to use the words "and reduced" for a month, but it was asked that in the present case the court would order that the words "and reduced" be used up to the 30th of September only. The court had a discretion under the Companies Act, 1877, s. 4, sub-section 2, to dispense with the use of the words, and there were special circumstances in this case. The old debentures issued by the company carried interest at the rate of 5½ per cent. upon the first debentures and 6 per cent. upon the second debentures, and these had to be exchanged for new ones carrying interest at 4½ per cent. on the 30th of September next under the scheme, and if the words "and reduced" had to be placed upon the new debentures the company would be prejudicially affected for all time.

RIDLEY, J., said that in his opinion the circumstances were such that the court might properly make the dispensation asked for. The order would therefore be as prayed and the proposed minute would be approved. The petitioners to use the words "and reduced" up to the 30th of September, 1897.—COUNSEL, *Alexander*, Q.C. (*The Hon. M. M. Macnaghten* with him). SOLICITORS, *Learoyd, James, & Mellor*.

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

LAW SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

VICTORIA PENSION FUND.

Subscriptions to the above Fund up to the 15th inst.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	8,362	1	0
F. Truefitt, 42, Theobald's-road, W.C	1	1	0
	£8,363	2	0

[We regret that the above was overlooked last week.]

Amount acknowledged last week	8,363	2	0
Ainsworth, Sanderson, & Howson, Blackburn, per Geo. Porter	5	5	0
L. & W. Wilkinson, " "	5	0	0
J. W. Carter, " "	2	2	0
M. Brothers, " "	1	1	0
	£8,376	10	0

NEW ORDERS, &c.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

LONG VACATION, 1897.

Notice.

During the Vacation until further Notice:—All applications which may require to be immediately or promptly heard, are to be made to the judges who for the time being shall act as Vacation Judges.

COURT BUSINESS.—Mr. Justice Ridley, one of the Vacation Judges, will, until further notice, sit in Q.B. Court IV., Royal Courts of Justice, at 11 a.m. on Wednesday in every week, commencing on Wednesday, 22nd of September, for the purpose of hearing such Applications of the above nature as, according to the practice of the Chancery Division, are usually heard in Court.

No case will be placed in the Judge's Paper unless leave has been previously obtained, or a Certificate of Counsel that the Case requires to be immediately or promptly heard, and stating concisely the reasons, is left with the papers.

The necessary Papers, relating to every Application made to the Vacation Judges (see notice below as to Judges' Papers), are to be left with the Cause Clerk in attendance, Chancery Registrars' Office, Room 136, Royal Courts of Justice, before 1 o'clock on the Monday previous to the day on which the Application is intended to be made. When the Cause Clerk is not in attendance, they may be left at Room 136, under cover, addressed to him, and marked outside Chancery Vacation Papers, or they may be sent by post, but in either case so as to be received by the time aforesaid.

URGENT MATTERS WHEN JUDGE NOT PRESENT IN COURT OR CHAMBERS.—Application may be made in any Case of urgency, to the Judge by post or rail, prepaid, accompanied by the brief of Counsel, office copies of the affidavits in support of the application, and also by a minute, on a separate sheet of paper, signed by Counsel, of the order he may consider the Applicant entitled to, and also an envelope, sufficiently stamped, capable of receiving the papers, addressed as follows:—"Chancery Official Letter: To the Registrar in Vacation, Chancery Registrar's Office, Royal Courts of Justice, London, W.C."

On Applications for Injunctions, in addition to the above, a copy of the writ, and a certificate of writ issued, must also be sent.

The papers sent to the Judge will be returned to the Registrar.

The Address of the Judge for the time being acting as Vacation Judge can be obtained on application at Room 136, Royal Courts of Justice.

CHANCERY CHAMBER BUSINESS.—The Chambers of Mr. Justice Romer will be open on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in every week, from 10 to 2 o'clock. Mr. Justice Ridley will, until further notice, hear urgent summonses which may be adjourned to him in his Private Room, No. 370, in the Royal Courts of Justice (Temple Bar Entrance), on Wednesday in every week, commencing on Wednesday, 22nd of September, at 10 30 a.m.

QUEEN'S BENCH CHAMBER BUSINESS.—Mr. Justice Ridley will, until further notice, sit for the disposal of Queen's Bench Business in Judges' Chambers on Tuesday and Thursday in every week, at 10.30 a.m. (except Tuesday, 21st September, when His Lordship will sit at 11 a.m.), commencing on Tuesday, 21st September.

DIVORCE.—Decrees nisi will be made absolute in Court on Wednesday, the 6th October.

JUDGE'S PAPERS FOR USE IN COURT.—Chancery Division.—The following Papers for the Vacation Judge, are required to be left with the Cause Clerk in attendance at the Chancery Registrars' Office, Room 136, Royal Courts of Justice, on or before 1 o'Clock, on the Monday previous to the day on which the Application to the Judge is intended to be made:—

1.—Counsel's Certificate of Urgency, or note of Special Leave granted by the Judge.

2.—Two Copies of Writ and two Copies of Pleadings (if any), and any other documents showing the nature of the Application.

3.—Two Copies of Notice of Motion.

4.—Office Copy Affidavits in support, and also Affidavits in answer (if any).

N.B.—Solicitors are requested when the Application has been disposed of, to apply at once to the Judge's Clerk in Court for the return of their Papers.

NOTICE TO SOLICITORS.

(Chancery Registrars' Office).

The Chancery Registrars' Office will be open daily. On Monday, the 16th August, and on the same day in every succeeding week during the Vacation, the Registrar in attendance will see Solicitors requiring alterations necessary in Orders to be acted on by the Paymaster.

ORDER OF TRANSFER.

Tuesday, the 14th day of September, 1897.

I, Hardinge Stanley, Baron Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby order that the action mentioned in the schedule hereto shall be transferred to the Honourable Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams.

SCHEDULE.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH (1897—D—No. 1,331).

In the Matter of David Jones & Co, ld Henry Lascelles Carr and others v David Jones & Co, ld.

HALSBURY, C.

It is stated that Sir Francis Jeune is laid up with an attack of rheumatism at Arlington Manor.

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENT.

Mr. C. J. Tennant Dunlop, barrister, of the North-Eastern Circuit, has been appointed Clerk of Arraigns of the Western Circuit, in succession to the late Mr. A. G. Bovill. Mr. Dunlop was called to the bar in November, 1874.

GENERAL.

At a special meeting of the Inverness Town Council on Wednesday it was resolved to present the freedom of the burgh to Sir R. B. Finlay, Q.C., M.P., Solicitor-General for England.

The *St. James's Gazette* says that Mr. Charles J. Stewart, clerk to the London County Council, and formerly Official Receiver to the Board of Trade, is seriously ill: he had been confined to his house for some days with an attack of influenza, and alarming symptoms of pneumonia had set in.

It is announced that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have entered into an agreement with the Corporation of Sheffield for the composition of the stamp duties payable on transfers of £342,000 Sheffield Corporation Two-and-a-half per Cent. Stock. Transfers executed on or after the 1st of September will be exempt from stamp duty.

The Irish Land Acts Commission commenced their sittings at Dublin on Wednesday. The chairman (Sir Edward Fry), in opening the proceedings, appealed to the parties "to give them—were they not under the shadow of the Four Courts?—the maximum of light with a minimum of heat."

The *Daily News* understands that the life-sized marble statue of the late Judge Thomas Hughes, which is to be erected at Rugby by old Rugbeians and others, has been entrusted for execution to Mr. Brock, R.A., who will carry out the work forthwith. Towards this object over £1,200 has been subscribed.

Some remarkable instances of depreciation in the letting value of land in Kent were, says the *Daily News*, brought to light at a meeting of the East Ashford Union Assessment Committee on Wednesday. In one case a farm in Romney Marsh was let, and after the agent had paid all the expenses he had in hand a balance of 9d. to remit to the owner, who had already paid tithe on the land to the extent of between 7s. and 8s. per acre. Many years ago the same farm let at £330 a year.

Mdlle. Chauvin has preferred a request to be allowed to practise as an *avocat*, which has afforded considerable amusement to the Paris journals. The *Figaro* thinks that in the interests of the poor prisoners we should really have lady advocates. If the prisoners only chose pretty ones, perhaps the advocates would not even need to open their mouths. A susceptible jury would only need to look at them to agree with everything they urged.

The 58th annual report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records, which has just been issued, says that "the new block of the Public Record Office, facing Chancery-lane, having been completed in 1895, as stated in my last report, the House of Commons voted a sum of £20,000 for the financial year 1896-7 towards the erection of another block, which will connect it with the portion erected between 1850 and 1871. The cost of this fourth instalment of the General Repository of Records is estimated at £50,000. The site having been cleared by the demolition of the Rolls House and Rolls Chapel, the work was begun in the month of February, 1896."

The *Times* says that the Local Government Board have decided a question of considerable importance as affecting the powers and rights of certain town councils. The Blandford town authority gave a tradesman permission to bring out his shop window over the pavement some 15in. to 18in., to be in a line with like windows on either side. The county council, who contribute towards the maintenance of the highway, demanded that the projection should be put back, as being an encroachment on the public footway. The town council refused to comply, considering that their powers and rights in this connection had not been abrogated by alliance with the county council for the purposes of the maintenance of main roads. The latter body thereupon withheld the sum of £31, due in respect of the portion of the highway in question, until the window was displaced. The result of the dispute was an appeal to the Local Government Board, who have supported the town council and ordered the county authority to pay the sum withheld and the cost of the inquiry.

A memorial service upon the late Mr. Herbert Bramley was held in Sheffield on Saturday, and the body was taken to Manchester the same evening and cremated at the Manchester Crematorium. The *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent* gives the following estimate of the characteristics as a lawyer of Mr. Bramley: "Mr. Bramley was an exceptionally sound lawyer. He rarely, if ever, appeared in the county court, and never took criminal work. He was a family lawyer, with an extensive practice in Chancery and conveyancing. In the latter branch of legal work he was remarkably safe. Very careful and cautious, able to grasp at once the value of a 'title,' his drafts always safeguarded to the letter the interests of his client. Mr. Bramley was one of those men who regarded a profession as something over and above a means of obtaining a livelihood. He was sensitive almost to punctiliousness on all points connected with professional honour and etiquette. No previous town clerk of Sheffield has had such a busy two years of office as fell to the lot of Mr. Bramley. The period was simply crowded with epoch-making events, and he was required to pilot several undertakings of vast magnitude and importance which the City Fathers considered to be for the benefit of the community through the tortuous paths of Parliamentary procedure. Mr. Bramley certainly won fame by the skilful and successful way in which he carried through Parliament the Bills authorising the great water scheme which is now being carried out in the Langsett Valley. This business was as vast in its dimensions as it was complicated in its details. The work that fell upon his shoulders in connection with these Water Bills was simply colossal. The adoption of the policy of municipalizing the tramway service marks an epoch in the municipal history of Sheffield, and this has occurred in Mr. Bramley's *régime*."

Warning to intending House Purchasers and Lessees.—Before purchasing or renting a house, have the Sanitary Arrangements thoroughly Examined, Tested, and Reported Upon by an Expert from Messrs. Carter Bros., 65, Victoria-street, Westminster. Fee quoted on receipt of full particulars. (Established 21 years.)—[Advt.]

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Sept. 30.—Messrs. Stimson & Sons, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Reversion to one-third of £18,000 in Railway Stock, the present market value being £28,000; lady aged 60. Solicitor, Albert Fleming, Esq., of London. Also Leasehold Ground-rents of £32 per annum, secured upon eight Residences in Barnsbury. Solicitors, Messrs. Fowkes & Son, of London. (See advertisement, Sept. 18, p. 4.)

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—Friday, Sept. 17.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

Caledonian (Ceylon) Tea Plantations, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Frederick Stanley, 11, Old Broad st Harwood & Stephenson, Lombard st, solors to the liquidator

Keighley Laundry Engineering Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Robertshaw, 2, Burlington chbrs, Keighley Ellis, Keighley, solor to the liquidator

Lucille Gold Mining Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henry Shaw, Spring gardens, Manchester Tweedale & Co, Oldham, solors for the liquidator

West Australian Publishing Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Meadowcroft, 57, Moorgate st

Unlimited in Chancery.

Royal Standard Permanent Benefit Building Society—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 14, directed to be heard before Ridley, J., on Sept 29. Riddell & Co, 9, John st, Bedford row, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 28

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Sept. 21.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

A 1 Biscuit Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Turkotine and Astley Henry Board, 52, Coleman st. Gush & Co, 3, Finsbury circus, solors for liquidators

Central Aspen Silver Mining Co, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Edmund Pike, 2 and 3, West st, Finsbury circus. Burn & Berridge, 11, Old Broad st, solors to liquidator

Fish Utilization Syndicate, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before Tuesday, Nov 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lindblad Grassie, 31, Queen Victoria st

Incandescent Fire Mantel and Stove Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Edwyn Baker, 53, Victoria st, Westminster Douglas Norman & Co, New ct, Carey st, solors to the liquidator

Figou, Wilks, & Laurence, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Tuesday, Nov 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Lee Nichols, 1, Queen Victoria st Horse & Co, Lincoln's inn fields, solors to liquidator

Strand Publishing Co, Limited—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 17, directed to be heard on Oct 27 Bannister & Reynolds, 70, Basinghall st, solors for petners Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 26

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

Good Intent Lodge, G.U.O.O.F., Leeds Unity, White Lion Inn, Rawtenstall, Manchester. Sept 9

Ormonde Sick and Funeral Sick Benefit Collecting Society, 1, Cleethorpe rd, Grimsby. Sept 8

Oxford Arms Friendly Society, Oxford Arms Inn, Kirtlington, Oxford. Sept 6

Southwick Philanthropic Society, Cricketers' Arms Inn, Southwick, Sussex. Sept 5

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

Last Day of Claim.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Aug. 24.

Green, Alfred, Bolton, Lancs Sept 24 Green v Nuttall, Registrar, Manchester Finney, Bolton

Lodge, Robert, Bishopdale, York, Gent Oct 1 Broderick v Lodge, Stirling, J Agnew, Manchester

London Gazette.—Friday, Aug. 27.

Lonsdale, Prudentia Sarah Jefferson, Greville pl, Kilburn Oct 23 Dowse v Fuller, Romer, J Dowse, New inn, Strand

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Sept. 7.

Monks, James, Aden Cottage, nr Durham Oct 1 Gibson v Barrow, Kekewich, J Stanley, Walsall

London Gazette.—Friday, Sept. 10.

Bannerman, Hugh, Southport, Lancs, Milliner Oct 15 Lowe v Bannerman, Registrar, Liverpool Mawdsley, Southport

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 17.

ANDERSON, MARY, Gateshead Oct 1 Baty & Fisher, Hexham

ASHTALL, JOHN, Birmingham Oct 20 Lee & Russell, Birmingham

AVERY, MARY MARTHA, Greenwich Sept 30 Romain, Bishopsgate st Without

BAILEY, MARIA, Cheadle, Chester Oct 13 Brown & Co, Stockport

BOULTBEE, EDWARD FRANCIS, Kensington Oct 1 Holbeche & Addenbrooke, Sutton Coldfield

BOURNE, COOMBER, Bethersden, Kent, Farmer Oct 1 Hallett & Co, Ashford

BUTCHER, GEORGE, Bath Sept 30 Little & Lyle, Bath

BUTCHER, ELIZABETH WHITEFOOT, Bath Sept 30 Little & Lyle, Bath

CARTER, MATILDA, Marchmont st, Russell sq Oct 7 Rye & Eyre, Golden sq

CHRISTIE, JAMES, Raleigh Club Oct 14 Burch & Co, Spring gdns

CLARIDGE, HENRY, Chadlington, Oxford, Farmer Oct 30 Wilkins & Toy, Chipping Norton

COATES, THOMAS NATHANIEL, Scarborough Nov 1 Dent, York

CRANE, ANNIE ELIZA, Herne Hill Oct 18 Routh & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury

DAVIES, ELIZABETH, Holywell, Flint Oct 1 Hughes & Hughes, Flint

DRAY, WILLIAM SENIOR, Sutton, Surrey Oct 1 Miller & Co, Telegraph st

EASTMAN, NOAH, Bideford, Devon, Yeoman Sept 29 Hole & Peard, Bideford

EVANS, SARAH, Llanllechid, Carnarvon Sept 30 Rowland, Bangor

FENNER, EDWIN, Bishop's Stortford, Herts, Licensed Victualler Sept 30 Burton & Son, Blackfriars rd

FOSTER, WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boscombe, Hants Oct 1 Harris & Son, New Broad st

FRASER, ROBERT WALTER McLEOD, Norfolk crescent Oct 25 Harwood & Stephenson, Lombard st

GIMBER, HARRIET, Birmingham Sept 17 Smith, Birmingham

HILL, JOHN, Maresfield, Sussex, Farmer Nov 3 Isaac Vinall, Lewes

HODGSON, JOHN, Astley Bridge, nr Bolton Sept 18 Russell, Bolton

HOWLETT, ROBERT, Honing, Norfolk, Yeoman Oct 1 Goodchild, Norwich

KELSALL, RICHARD DICKINSON, Waterloo, Lancaster, Fish Salesman Oct 7 Parkinson, Liverpool

LEIGARD, FRANCES, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick Oct 1 Holbeche & Addenbrooke, Sutton Coldfield

LYALL, MARY, Thornaby on Tees, York Oct 7 Thomas & Malkin, Stockton on Tees

MARTIN, ANN GOODWIN, Chaddesden, Derby Oct 15 Smith & Bostock, Derby

MORRIS, FREDERIC WILLIAM NOEL, Bishopsgate st Within Dec 1 Chandler & Rumbold, Bishopsgate st Within

WADDILOVE, MARIE ELIZABETH CAMPBELL, Gunnersbury Oct 15 Roy & Cartwright, Coleman st

WATERHOUSE, JAMES, Brimington Common, nr Chesterfield, Farmer Oct 2 Jones & Middleton, Chesterfield

WILD, ALFRED, Littleborough Oct 1 Charles & Co, Manchester

WINDROVE, HENRY, Chesham, Bucks Oct 29 Francis & How, Chesham

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Roath, Cardiff, Farmer Oct 31 Lewis & Jones, Merthyr Tydfil

ROBERTSON, CHARLES ALEXANDER LOCKHART, M.D. Wimbledon Oct 25 Keddey & Co, Fenchurch st

ROGERS, WILLIAM, Newton, Hereford, Farmer Sept 25 Symonds & Son, Hereford

SCOTT, FREDERICA GERTRUDE CHARLOTTE, Slough, Bucks Oct 4 Bone & Heppel, Frederick's pl, Old Jewry

SHEPHERD, JOHN, Alnmouth, Northumberland, Tailor Oct 20 Hindmarsh, Alnwick

SYKES, HANNAH, Clayton, nr Bradford Oct 2 Freeman, Bradford

SYPE, JAMES, Clapham rd Oct 4 Barnard, Westminster Bridge rd

TAFF, ABRAHAM, Isle Abbotts, Somerset Sept 29 Hill & Son, Langport

TAFF, ROBERT, Isle Abbotts, Somerset, Machinist Sept 29 Hill & Son, Langport

THOMAS, WILLIAM, Southport Sept 30 Robinson, Southport

TRUMPLER, WILLIAM HENRY, Sydenham Nov 4 Francis Voules & Co, Eastcheap

TAYLOR, ALFRED, Bolton, Surgeon Oct 2 Phethean Monks, Bolton

UPTON, ALICE, Chichester Sept 21 Bramsdon, Portsmouth

UPTON, ROSE, Chichester Sept 21 Bramsdon, Portsmouth

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 7.

ALLEN, ELIZABETH JANE, Auckland, New Zealand Oct 11 Andrew & Co, Great James st

ALLEN, JOHN, Woolwich Oct 9 Watkins, Basinghall st

ALLSUP, WILLIAM, Freckleton, Lancs Sept 18 Whitehead, Preston

ANDREW, MATTHEW, Congleton, Chester, Butcher Sept 30 Steele Sheldon, Congleton

ATKINS, MARY, Ealing Oct 11 Andrew & Co, Great James st, Bedford row

BAILEY, GEORGE, Luton, Bedford, Solicitor Oct 27 Gates, Luton

BOSSOWMAN, JOHN, Pembroke Dock, Travelling Draper Oct 5 Hughes Brown, Pembroke

BULLOCK, ERNEST ALFRED, Uxbridge Oct 7 Dale & Co, Cornhill

CHAPLIN, JAMES HOPPER, Earl's Court Oct 20 Lindo & Co, West st, Finsbury circus

DODWORTH, ALFRED CHARLES, Sheffield Sept 30 Wragg, Rotherham

ELKINGTON, GEORGE, Worthing Oct 30 Dommett & Son, Gresham st

EVANS, Captain HUGH, Neyland, Pembroke Oct 4 Hughes Brown Pembroke Dock

FISK, SOPHIA, Ipswich Oct 11 Jackaman & Co, Ipswich

FRYER, JOSEPH HARGRAVES, Preston, Joiner Oct 18 W & J Cooper, Preston

GLEW, JOHN THOMAS, Birmingham Sept 30 Price & Son, Birmingham

GRIBSON, WILLIAM, Newcastle on Tyne, Draper Sept 30 Wooler & Wooler, Darlington

HITHERSAY, SAMUEL, Nottingham, Provision Merchant Oct 12 Johnstone & Williams, Nottingham

INNES, MARY JANE CHARLTON, Whitley, Northumberland Oct 2 Percy, Alnwick

JELLEY, THOMAS EDMUND SMITH, Frome, Somerset Sept 30 E G Ames & Son, Frome

JOSSELYN, MARY ANN SARAH, Fornham Priory, Suffolk Oct 2 Josselyn & Sons, Ipswich

KNIGHT, JOHN, Birmingham, Iron and Brass Moulder Oct 16 Shute & Swinson, Birmingham

LESLIE, HENRY LEVY, Hoolgerrig, nr Abergavenny, Mon Sept 30 Price & Son, Birmingham

MACFARLAND, CHARLES CORNELIUS, Streatham Oct 25 Minet & Co, King William st

MACLEOD, CHRISTINA REBECCA, Llandudno Oct 9 Renshaw & Co, Suffolk la

MILVAIN, ELIZABETH, Northumberland Oct 19 Hoyle & Co, Newcastle upon Tyne

POSTANCE, WILLIAM EDMUND, Rhyl, Flint Oct 14 Bremner & Co, Liverpool

PRYCE, FRANCIS HORATIO, LUCY JANE PRYCE, and their children, ALICE PRYCE and EDWARD PRYCE, all of Southsea Oct 11 Wood & Purves, Gt James st, Bedford row

RAY, BRISCO, Brighton Oct 11 Paterson, Finsbury circus

SPICER, JANE, Ealing Oct 11 Andrew & Co, Gt James st

SPICER, MARY MARGARET, Hampstead Oct 11 Andrew & Co, Great James st

TAYLOR, BENJAMIN, Forest Gate, Essex Oct 14 G. Turner, Leadenhall st

WALES, JAMES, Guiseley, York Oct 20 Wade & Co, Bradford

WHEELER, ELLEN, Solihull, Warwick Sept 30 Price & Son, Birmingham

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Abernant, Aberdare, Glam Nov 2 Linton & Co, Aberdare

WILSON, Rev ROBERT JAMES, D.D., Oxford Sept 28 Harries & Co, Nicholas lane

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 17.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BENNETT, WILLIAM, Liverpool, Ironmonger Liverpool Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

BICKERDIKE, SARAH EMMA, Bradford Bradford Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

BURDEN, RICHARD, Nottingham, Brushmaker Nottingham Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

BROWN, JOSEPH WILLIAMS, Blisland, Cornwall, Miller Truro Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

COHEN, ISRAEL, Pentre, Ystradyfodwg, Glam, Painter Pontypridd Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

CRAWFORD, RICHARD, Tottenham Court rd, Milliner High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 14

DALLISON, WILLIAM, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Collier Nottingham Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

DAVIES, MARIAN, Gt Russell st High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

DUNSHILL, HENRY, Dorking Croydon Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

EDGAR, JAMES, Seacombe, Cheshire, Brickmaker Birkenhead Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 14

EVE, HENRY, Liverpool, Restaurant Proprietor Liverpool Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

FOULDS, BENJAMIN JAMES, Bradford, Tailor Bradford Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

GILL, JAMES JOHN, Hornsey Park rd, Carpenter High Court Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

GURNEY, A, Catherine st, Strathing la High Court Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 15

HARDRA, WILLIAM, Aberavon, China Dealer Neath Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

JENKINS, EDWIN, Bridgend, Glam, Sculptor Cardiff Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

JENKINS, WILLIAM, Swansea, Licensed Victualler Swansea Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

JENNINGS, FRANCIS JAMES, Burton on Trent, Solicitor Burton on Trent Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 11

KELLAWAY, ERNEST ALFRED, Branksome, Dorset, Cabinet Maker Poole Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

LEES, JOHN EBENEZER, Wrexham, Architect Wrexham Pet July 19 Ord Sept 13

MARES, JOHN, Birkenhead, Fishmonger Birkenhead Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

MARLEY, BERTIE, Sutton Croydon Pet July 21 Ord Sept 14

MARTIN, JOHN, Pontypridd, Picture Frame Maker Pontypridd Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

MESSENGER, ARTHUR, Nottingham, Saddler Nottingham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

MILLINGTON, WILLIAM HENRY, Gt Yarmouth Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

PERCIVAL, MARGARET FRANCES, Cradley, Hereford Worcester Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

POWELL, CAROLINE, Shepherd's Bush, Draper High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 15

REES, DAVID, Dowlais, Glam, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

SMITH, GEORGE ERNEST, Starbeck, Yeast Agent York Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

STEVENS, AMBROSE, North Lopham, Norfolk, Engine Driver Ipswich Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

SYDENHAM, HENRY JAMES, Poole, Corn Dealer Poole Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

TAUNTON, CHARLES EDMUND, Handsworth, Engineer Birmingham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

TUTTY, WILLIAM, Welton, Lincs, Grocer Boston Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 14

WATSON, JAMES ALBERT, Brighton, Dairyman Brighton Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

WILLIAMS, EDWARD, Pontypridd, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

WILSON, GEORGE JOHN, Oxford, Surgeon Oxford Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 14

YARDLEY, WILLIAM, Regent's Park, Barrister High Court Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

YEABSLEY, WILLIAM SCRIVENER, Reading, Coal Merchant Reading Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

FIRST MEETINGS.

BARBER, HUGH, Mobberley, Chester, Farmer Sept 24 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

BENNETT, JOHN, Cardiff, Insurance Agent Sept 27 at 11.30 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff

BENNETT, PARKIN, Rotherham, Yorks, Hay Dealer Sept 24 at 2.30 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield

BOSWELL, ALFRED, Bournemouth, Colour Maker Sept 24 at 12.30 Off Rec, Salisbury

CARPENTER, GEORGE, Bristol, Boot Manufacturer Oct 6 at 1 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol

DODSWORTH, GEORGE PERCIVAL, Albemarle st, War Correspondent Sept 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

DYMOND, WILLIAM JOHN, Plymouth, Tobacconist Sept 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, 10, Athenæum ter, Plymouth

EVANS, PETER, Penygroes, Carmarthen, Builder Sept 25 at 12.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

EVE, HENRY, Liverpool, Restaurant Proprietor Sept 29 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

FRANCIS, EDWIN FRANCIS, Lewisham High rd, Provision Merchant Sept 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

GILL, JAMES JOHN, Hornsey Park rd, Carpenter Sept 29 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

GRAY, JAMES, Kingsdown, Bristol, Grocer Oct 6 at 3 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol

GÜNTHER, GOTTLOB, Whitechapel, Bearhouse Keeper Sept 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

GURNEY, A, Catherine court, Seething lane Sept 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HARDING, CHARLES HENRY, Bristol, Butcher Oct 6 at 12.30 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol

HIGGENS, WALTER RICHARD HOWEL, Bournemouth Sept 24 at 1 Off Rec, Salisbury

HORN, PRIESTMAN, South Bank, York, Beer Retailer Sept 29 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

HULL, WILLIAM HENRY, Chester, Butcher Sept 24 at 12.30 Crypt chmbrs, Chester

JONES, DAVID, Llanelly, House Furnisher Sept 25 at 10.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

KING, JAMES, Pontlottyn, Glam, Grocer Sept 24 at 12 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

MARSHALL, DAVID, Wrabness, Essex, Farmer Sept 24 at 12 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich

MATTHEWS, W 2, Sutton, Surrey, Builder Sept 24 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London bridge

MORGAN, THOMAS, Llancarnlet, Glam, Grocer Sept 24 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea

REED, JOHN HENRY, and WILLIAM REED, West Hartlepool, Grocers Sept 24 at 2.30 Royal Hotel, West Hartlepool

RICHARDS, JOHN, Whitland, Pembroke, Mason Sept 25 at 2.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

ROWLANDS, WILLIAM, Dinas Cross, Pembroke, Lime Merchant Sept 25 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

SAWYER, HERBERT JOHN, Whitechapel, Contractor Sept 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

SCOTT, GEORGE, Cardiff, Baker Sept 27 at 11 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff

SMITH, GEORGE ERNEST, Starbeck, Yeast Agent Sept 27 at 3.30 Off Rec, 28, Stonegate, York

SPEAR, ARTHUR JAMES, Bristol, Hatter Oct 6 at 2.30 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol

STEVENS, AMBROSE, North Lopham, Norfolk, Engine Driver Sept 24 at 12.30 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich

SUNLEY, WILLIAM, Stokesley, Innkeeper Sept 29 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

THORNTON, ALBERT HUDSON, Halifax, Labourer Oct 4 at 11.30 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax

TUTTON, WALTER DOUGLAS, Eastney, Portsmouth, Grocer Sept 28 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junctn, High st, Portsmouth

WAIND, FREDERICK, York, Tailor Sept 27 at 12.15 Off Rec, 28, Stonegate, York

WATSON, JAMES ALBERT, Brighton, Dairyman Sept 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Clydach Vale, Glam, Grocer Sept 25 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

YEADON, WILLIAM SCRIVENER, Reading, Coal Merchant Sept 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

BARBER, HUGH, Mobberley, Chester, Farmer Manchester Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 14

BAYLISS, WALTER LIONEL, Stoke upon Trent, Dealer in Drugs Stoke upon Trent Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 13

BICKERDIKE, SARAH EMMA, Bradford Bradford Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

BRIDGES, RICHARD, Nottingham, Brushmaker Nottingham Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

BROWN, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Blisland, Cornwall, Miller Truro Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

CAPEWELL, WALTER, and JAMES LAWRENCE BRAZIER, Wolverhampton, Cycle Manufacturers Wolverhampton Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 13

COHEN, ISRAEL, Pentre, Ystradyfodwg, Glam, Painter Pontypridd Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

CRAWFORD, RICHARD, Tottenham Court rd, Milliner High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 15

DALLISON, WILLIAM, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Collier Nottingham Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

DAVIES, MARIAN, Gt Russell st High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

DUNSELL, HENRY, Dorking Croydon Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

EVE, HENRY, Liverpool, Restaurant Proprietor Liverpool Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

FOULDS, BENJAMIN JAMES, Bradford, Tailor Bradford Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

FRANCIS, EDWIN FRANCIS, Lewisham High rd, Provision Merchant High Court Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 13

GILL, JAMES JOHN, Hornsey Park rd, Carpenter High Court Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

GREENFIELD, ROBERT, Leamington, Nurseryman Warwick Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 7

GUNTHER, GOTTLOB, Whitechapel, Beerhouse Keeper High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 14

HENDRA, WILLIAM, Aberavon, Glam, China Dealer Neath Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

HONOUR, RICHARD GEORGE, Terrace rd, Upton Manor, Greengrocer High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 11

JENKINS, EDWIN, Bridgend, Glam, Sculptor Cardiff Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

JENKINS, WILLIAM, Swansea, Licensed Victualler Swansea Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

JENNINGS, FRANCIS JAMES, Burton on Trent, Solicitor Burton on Trent Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 11

KELLAWAY, ERNEST ALFRED, Branksome, Dorset, Cabinet Maker Poole Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

KING, OWEN, Newcastle on Tyne, Draper Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 7 Ord Sept 14

LANE, JAMES WILLIAM, Nantwich, Boot Manufacturer Nantwich Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 13

LAWRENCE, THOMAS, Gloucester, Farmer Bristol Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 15

MARSH, ROBERT, Hyde, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler Ashton under Lyne Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 12

MARTIN, JOHN, Pontypridd, Picture Frame Maker Pontypridd Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

MESSENGER, ARTHUR, Nottingham, Saddler Nottingham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

MILLINGTON, WILLIAM HENRY, Gt Yarmouth Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

NEWMAN, HORACE, Old Catton, Norfolk, Farmer Norwich Pet June 9 Ord Sept 13

NYE, EDWARD HENRY, Dover, Cycle Maker Canterbury Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 13

OLSWANG, JACQUES, Waterloo, Lancs, Furniture Dealer Liverpool Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 14

PERCIVAL, MARGARET FRANCES, Cradley, Hereford Worcester Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

POWELL, CAROLINE, Shepherd's Bush, Draper High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 15

REES, DAVID, Dowlais, Glam, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

ROBINSON, LILIAN MOORE, Edenbridge, Kent Tunbridge Wells Pet May 13 Ord Sept 13

ROWLANDS, WILLIAM, Dinas Cross, Pembrokeshire, Lime Merchant Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 14

SMITH, GEORGE ERNEST, Starbeck, Boroughbridge, Yeast Agent York Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

STEVENS, AMBROSE, North Lopham, Norfolk, Engine Driver Ipswich Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

SYDENHAM, HENRY JAMES, Poole, Dorset, Corn Dealer Poole Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 13

VERDUS, THOMAS, jun, Walbrook, Photo-Engraver High Court Pet June 10 Ord Sept 13

WATSON, JAMES ALBERT, Brighton, Dairyman Brighton Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 14

WHEELER, GEORGE FREDERICK SMITH, Mansfield rd, Haverstock hill, Manager High Court Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 13

WILLIAMS, EDWARD, Pontypridd, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

YARDLEY, WILLIAM, Albert rd, Regent's Park, Barrister High Court Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

YEADON, WILLIAM SCRIVENER, Reading, Coal Merchant Reading Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 21.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ABEL, JAMES, Victoria st, Restaurant Proprietor High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

BELL, JOHN, South Bank, York, Grocer Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

BEVERIDGE, GEORGE ALFRED SPOWART, Shrewsbury Shrewsbury Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

BLOUNT, WILLIAM, Coseley, Staffs, Baker Dudley Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

BRIGHTWELL, JOHN JAMES, Horley Fields, Oxford, Farmer Banbury Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

BURNSIDE, ROBERT HAZELDINE, Sunderland, Metal Broker Sunderland Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

COLLINS, JOHN, jun, Newcastle on Tyne, General Dealer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

CROPPER, MATTHIAS, Manchester, Carrier Manchester Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 16

EMMENS, GEORGE, Basinghall st, Mine Purser High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Sept 18

FERLAND, HARRIS, Whitechapel rd, Tailor High Court Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

GABB, JAMES EDWARD, Shrewsbury, Physician Shrewsbury Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

GILDERS, GEORGE, Haverstock Hill, Chaff Merchant High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 17

HARING, CAREL NATHAN, Manchester, Merchant Manchester Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

HARLEY, ARTHUR COLBOURNE, Walsall, Music Seller Walsall Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

HARVEY, JESSE, Birmingham, Greengrocer Birmingham Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

HEWER, ALFRED W, Golden sq High Court Pet Aug 4 Ord Sept 17

HIBBERT, JOHN JAMES, and JOHN HALL COOPER MCDOWELL, Manchester Manchester Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 17

HIRST, ARTHUR, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer Leeds Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 13

HOLLINGWORTH, JOHN LAWRENCE PITCHFORT, Barnsley, Yorks, Chemist Barnsley Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

HOWARTH, WILLIAM, Greenwich, Shipbroker's Clerk Greenwich Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

HUNTER, WILLIAM SKELTON, Heeley, Sheffield, General Dealer Sheffield Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 16

JACOBS, L, Bethnal Green, Hardware Merchant High Court Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 17

LANE, ARTHUR JAMES High Court Pet Aug 6 Ord Sept 15

LAWRENCE, EDWIN, Leicester Leicester Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

LEWIS, ARTHUR POLLARD, Llanelly Carmarthen Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

LEWIS, FREDERIC CORNWALL, Coventry Coventry Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 16

LOADER, ROWLAND JAMES, Southsea, Harness Maker Portsmouth Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

MARSHALL, DALE, Cheltenham, Cycle Dealer Cheltenham Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

MATHEWS, JOSEPH, Warrington, Builder Warrington Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

MOULD, JOHN ALFRED, Clapham, Hosier High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

OSCROFT, WILLIAM DENNIS, Nottingham, Grocer's Assistant Nottingham Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 17

PETERSEN, JORGEN HANSEN, and ARTHUR AUSTIN, Oxford st High Court Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 17

PRICE, HERBERT, Streatham High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

SHADLOCK, GEORGE, Gt Grimsby, Bootmaker Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

SHEPPARD, CHARLES, Ryde, I of W, Boot Dealer Newport Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

SMITH, FREDERICK, Halifax, Plumber Halifax Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

STANTON, EDMUND C, Queen Anne's mansns, Westminster High Court Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 17

STRUDWICK, ROBERT HAWKINS, Dalston, Provision Dealer High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

SUTHERST, THOMAS, Grosvenor sq, Gent High Court Pet April 14 Ord May 20

THOMAS, ALFRED, Coleman st, Mining Engineer High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Sept 16

TOWERS, WILLIAM, Peterborough, Grocer Peterborough Pet July 23 Ord Sept 18

TWIDALE, MARY ANN, West Butterwick, Lincs, Brick Manufacturer Lincoln Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

UNDERHILL, GEORGE, jun, Worcester, Butcher Worcester Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

WADSWORTH, SAMUEL JAMES, Aberdare, Oil Vendor Aberdare Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

WILSON, FRANCIS LAWRENCE, Manchester, Furniture Dealer Manchester Pet July 16 Ord Sept 16

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept. 13:

SMITH, GEORGE WALTER, jun, Leeds, Stationer Leeds Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 10

FIRST MEETINGS.

ABEL, JAMES, Victoria st, Restaurant Proprietor Sept 28 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BEVERIDGE, GEORGE ALFRED SPOWART, Shrewsbury Shrewsbury Sept 29 at 11 Off Rec, Shrewsbury

BICKERDIKE, SARAH EMMA, Bradford, Lodging house Keeper Sept 28 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

BLACKMORE, ALBERT GLANVILLE, Irthlingborough, Northampton, Currier Sept 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BROWN, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Blisland, Cornwall, Miller Sept 30 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro

CRAWFORD, RICHARD, Tottenham Court rd, Milliner Sept 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

DALLISON, WILLIAM, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Collier Sept 28 at 11 Off Rec, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham

DAFT, WILLIAM, Nottingham, Butcher Sept 28 at 3 Off Rec, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham

DAVIES, MARIAN, Great Russell st Sept 29 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

FERLAND, HARRIS, Whitechapel rd, Tailor Sept 30 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

FOULDS, BENJAMIN JAMES, Bradford, Tailor Sept 29 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

GABB, JAMES EDWARD, Shrewsbury Physician Sept 29 at 12 Off Rec, Shrewsbury

GILDERS, GEORGE, Haverstock Hill, Chaff Merchant Sept 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HENDRA, WILLIAM, Aberavon, China Dealer Sept 28 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea

HIRST, ARTHUR, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer Oct 1 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

JACOBS, L, Bethnal Green, Hardware Merchant Sept 30 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

LUMB, EDWIN, Dewsbury, Commission Agent Sept 29 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Batley

MCDONALD, JAMES DANIEL, Mansfield, Notts, Grocer Sept 28 at 11 Off Rec, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham

MARSH, ROBERT, Hyde, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler Sept 29 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

PARTRIDGE, JAMES, Darlaston, Boat Builder Sept 29 at 11 Off Rec, Walsall

POOLE, JOSEPH, Earlestown, Lancs, Tailor Sept 29 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

REED, ARTHUR LINCOLN, King's Bench walk, Barrister Sept 28 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

SHADLOCK, GEORGE, Gt Grimsby, Bootmaker Sept 28 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby

SMITH, FREDERICK, Halifax, Plumber Oct 4 at 12 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax

SMITH, GEORGE WALTER, jun, Leeds, Stationer Sept 29 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

SWISS, ALFRED HENRY, Devonport, Bookseller Sept 30 at 3 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

BELL, JOHN, South Bank, York, Grocer Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

BENNETT, JOHN, Cardiff, Insurance Agent Cardiff Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 15

BEVERIDGE, GEORGE ALFRED SPOWART, Shrewsbury Shrewsbury Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

BLOUNT, WILLIAM, Coseley, Staffs, Baker Dudley Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 16

BOOTHBY, THOMAS, New Turnstile, Holborn, Carpenter High Court Pet July 5 Ord Sept 18

BOSWELL, ALFRED, Bournemouth, Colour Maker Poole Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 16

BURNSIDE, ROBERT HAZELDINE, Sunderland, Metal Broker Sunderland Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

COLLINS, JOHN, jun, Newcastle on Tyne, General Dealer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 18

DANIELL, AUGUSTUS WARWICK BAMFYLDE, Kembury, Devon High Court Pet July 3 Ord Sept 16

DREW, ERNEST, FRANK DREW, and ARTHUR ERNEST DANES, Kentish Town rd, Stationers High Court Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 17

EAMES, SAMUEL GEORGE, Somerset, Watchmaker Bath Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 14

FERLAND, HARRIS, Whitechapel, Tailor High Court Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 18

HARLEY, ARTHUR COLBORNE, Walsall, Music Seller Walsall Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

HARVEY, JESSE, Birmingham, Greengrocer Birmingham Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

HERBER, SIDNEY, Coleman st High Court Pet July 2 Ord Sept 18

HICKENS, WALTER RICHARD HOWEL, Bournemouth Poole Pet Aug 7 Ord Sept 16

LAWRENCE, EDWIN, Leicester Leicester Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

LOADER, ROWLAND JAMES, Portsmouth, Harness Maker Portsmouth Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

MARSHALL, DALE, Cheltenham, Cycle Dealer Cheltenham Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

MATHEWS, JOSEPH, Warrington, Builder Warrington Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

MOULD, JOHN ALFRED, Clapham, Hosier High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

PRICE, HERBERT, Streatham High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18

SHADLOCK, GEORGE, Gt Grimsby, Bootmaker Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14

SMITH, FREDERICK, Halifax, Plumber Halifax Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

STRUDWICK, ROBERT HAWKINS, Dalston, Provision Dealer High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

TUTTON, WALTER DOUGLAS, Portsmouth, Grocer Portsmouth Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 15

UNDERHILL, GEORGE, jun, Worcester, Butcher Worcester Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

WADSWORTH, SAMUEL JAMES, Aberdare, Oil Vendor Aberdare Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17

WILKINSON, J D, and ISAAC MILES, Shadwell High Court Pet July 9 Ord Sept 18

WRIGHT, LOUIS B, Hounslow Brentford Pet June 8 Ord Sept 15

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

Corporation Robes, University and Clergy Gowns.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.